

2018 Current Fiscal Year Report: National Library of Medicine Special Emphasis Panel

Report Run Date: 06/05/2019 12:08:24 PM

1. Department or Agency

Department of Health and Human Services

2. Fiscal Year

2018

3. Committee or Subcommittee

National Library of Medicine Special Emphasis Panel

3b. GSA Committee No.

2081

4. Is this New During Fiscal Year?

No

5. Current Charter

09/29/1995

6. Expected Renewal Date

7. Expected Term Date

8a. Was Terminated During Fiscal Year?

No

8b. Specific Termination Authority

8c. Actual Term Date

9. Agency Recommendation for Next Fiscal Year

Continue

10a. Legislation Req to Terminate?

Not Applicable

10b. Legislation Pending?

Not Applicable

11. Establishment Authority

Authorized by Law

12. Specific Establishment Authority

42 USC 282(b)(16)

13. Effective Date

11/20/1985

14. Committee Type

Continuing

14c. Presidential?

No

15. Description of Committee

Special Emphasis Panel

16a. Total Number of Reports

No Reports for this Fiscal Year

17a. Open Meetings and Dates 0 17b. Closed Meetings and Dates 4 17c. Partially Closed Meetings and Dates 0 17d. Total Meetings and Dates 4

Purpose

Start

End

NIH Peer Review

12/01/2017

- 12/01/2017

NIH Peer Review

03/23/2018

- 03/23/2018

NIH Peer Review

07/13/2018

- 07/13/2018

NIH Peer Review

07/27/2018

- 07/27/2018

Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 4

18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members

Current FY Next FY

\$10,400.00 \$10,400.00

18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members

\$0.00 \$0.00

18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff

\$38,422.00 \$39,152.00

18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants

\$0.00 \$0.00

18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members

\$0.00 \$0.00

18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members

\$0.00 \$0.00

18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff

\$0.00 \$0.00

18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants

\$0.00 \$0.00

18c. Other(rents,user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)	\$0.00	\$0.00
18d. Total	\$48,822.00	\$49,552.00
19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)	0.30	0.30

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

This committee is composed of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first-level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications (and/or contract proposals) in the fields of medical library services, health science publications, integrated biotechnology information, databases, resources, and educational technology. During this reporting period, 4 special emphasis panels met and reviewed a total of 88 applications recommending \$103,900,610.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

This committee has a fluid membership with members designated to serve for individual meetings rather than formally appointed for fixed terms of service. The reviewers for each meeting are selected to evaluate grant applications or contract proposals for a specific, perhaps narrow, expertise area in medical library services, health science publications, integrated biotechnology information, data bases, resources and educational technology. Participants for each meeting are assembled to most efficiently and effectively cover the number and breadth of applications or contracts requiring review.

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

The National Library of Medicine Special Emphasis Panel held 4 meetings during this reporting period. The flexibility in review allowed by this committee structure has been proven both efficient and effective.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

This committee is composed of recognized biomedical and/or behavioral research authorities who represent the forefront of research and technical knowledge and who provide first level merit review of highly scientific and technical research grant applications and contract proposals. These evaluations and recommendations cannot be obtained from other sources because the specialized, complex nature of the applications and proposals requires a unique balance and breadth of expertise not available on the NIH staff or from other established sources.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

The meetings of the National Library of Medicine Special Emphasis Panel were closed to

the public for the review of grant applications. Sections 552b(c)(4) and 552b(c)(6) of the Government in the Sunshine Act permit the closing of meetings where discussion could reveal confidential trade secrets or commercial property such as patentable material and personal information, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

21. Remarks

This committee did not produce any reports during this reporting period. This committee does not have a dedicated website. Committee Decision Maker and Designated Federal Official are the same individual based on assigned duties within NLM.

Designated Federal Officer

ZOE HUANG CHIEF SCIENTIFIC REVIEW OFFICER

Committee Members	Start	End	Occupation	Member Designation
ALPI, KRISTINE	07/27/2018	07/27/2018	DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
ANDREWS, BRIDIE	07/13/2018	07/13/2018	CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
BUI, ALEX	07/27/2018	07/27/2018	DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
CONNOLLY, CYNTHIA	07/13/2018	07/13/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
CONSALES, JUDITH	07/13/2018	07/13/2018	ASSOCIATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN	Peer Review Consultant Member
CRENNER, CHRISTOPHER	07/13/2018	07/13/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
DAVIS, FREDERICK	07/13/2018	07/13/2018	PROFESSOR AND CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
ELKIN, PETER	03/23/2018	03/23/2018	PROFESSOR AND CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
EVANS, H. HUGHES	07/13/2018	07/13/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
GALLAGHER, CATHERINE	07/13/2018	07/13/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
GANTENBEIN, REX	07/27/2018	07/27/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
GREENE, CASEY	12/01/2017	12/01/2017	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
GROGAN, COLLEEN	07/13/2018	07/13/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
HIRSHBEIN, LAURA	07/13/2018	07/13/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
KALPATHY-CRAMER, JAYASHREE	07/27/2018	07/27/2018	ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
KINOSIAN, BRUCE	07/27/2018	07/27/2018	ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
LEHMANN, HAROLD	07/27/2018	07/27/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
LENERT, LESLIE	03/23/2018	03/23/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
LINTON, DEREK	07/13/2018	07/13/2018	PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member

LIU, YUNLONG	07/27/2018 07/27/2018 PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MENDONCA, ENEIDA	07/27/2018 07/27/2018 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
MUNGALL, CHRISTOPHER	03/23/2018 03/23/2018 SCIENTIST	Peer Review Consultant Member
NEWHOUSE, PAUL	07/13/2018 07/13/2018 CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
OHNO-MACHADO, LUCILA	07/13/2018 07/13/2018 PROFESSOR AND CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
OZAYDIN, BUNYAMIN	07/27/2018 07/27/2018 ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
PATEL, VIMLA	07/13/2018 07/13/2018 SENIOR RESEARCH SCIENTIST AND DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
PEARSON, WILLIAM	03/23/2018 03/23/2018 PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
PINSKY, SETH	12/01/2017 12/01/2017 RETIRED DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
PODOLSKY, SCOTT	07/13/2018 07/13/2018 PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
POLLIN, TONI	07/13/2018 07/13/2018 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
ROSNER, DAVID	07/13/2018 07/13/2018 PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SAHA, PUNAM	07/27/2018 07/27/2018 PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SCHLEYER, TITUS	03/23/2018 03/23/2018 RESEARCH SCIENTIST	Peer Review Consultant Member
SCOTCH, MATTHEW	12/01/2017 12/01/2017 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SHEN, LI	07/27/2018 07/27/2018 PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SHOJAIE, ALI	03/23/2018 03/23/2018 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SIMON, GYORGY	07/27/2018 07/27/2018 ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SITTIG, DEAN	12/01/2017 12/01/2017 PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
STARREN, JUSTIN	07/27/2018 07/27/2018 PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
SUMMERS-ABLES, JOY	03/23/2018 03/23/2018 DIRECTOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
VEINOT, TIFFANY	07/27/2018 07/27/2018 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
VISWESWARAN, SHYAM	07/27/2018 07/27/2018 ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member
WOLF, JACQUELINE	07/13/2018 07/13/2018 PROFESSOR AND DEPARTMENT CHAIR	Peer Review Consultant Member
ZHAO, HONGYU	07/27/2018 07/27/2018 PROFESSOR	Peer Review Consultant Member

Number of Committee Members Listed: 44

Narrative Description

The Special Emphasis Panels are established to provide grant review for a variety of

grant or contract applications for which specialized reviews are required. The NLM SEP peer reviews include Publications, Research, and Training Grants.

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Improvements to health or safety | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Trust in government | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Major policy changes | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Advance in scientific research | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Effective grant making | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Improved service delivery | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Increased customer satisfaction | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Outcome Comments

N/A

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

Checked if Applies

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| None | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Unable to Determine | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Under \$100,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$100,000 - \$500,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$500,001 - \$1,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| \$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Over \$10,000,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Cost Savings Other | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Cost Savings Comments

NIH supported basic and clinical research accomplishments often take many years to unfold into new diagnostic tests and new ways to treat and prevent disease.

What is the approximate Number of recommendations produced by this committee for the life of the committee?

2,110

Number of Recommendations Comments

A total of 88 grant applications were reviewed in FY 2018.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Fully implemented by the agency?

20%

% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level or review performed by the Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

What is the approximate Percentage of these recommendations that have been or will be Partially implemented by the agency?

0%

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

NIH Peer Review Committees are involved in the initial review of research grant applications. The NIH dual peer review system is mandated by statute in accordance with section 492 of the Public Health Service Act. The charge to this committee is to determine scientific and technical merit of the individual grants or contracts. These recommendations are forwarded to Federal officials who generally accept the committee's recommendations and favorable applications are then forwarded for the second level or review performed by the Institute and Center (IC) National Advisory Councils or Boards. Only applications that are favorably recommended by both the initial peer review committee and the Advisory Council may be recommended for funding.

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes ☐ No ☒ Not Applicable ☐

Agency Feedback Comments

N/A

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or recommendation?

Checked if Applies

Reorganized Priorities	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reallocated resources	<input type="checkbox"/>
Issued new regulation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Proposed legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Approved grants or other payments	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>

Action Comments

An action of "approved" or "recommended" for grants receiving initial peer review by this committee does not infer that the grant will be or has been funded. Research grant applications submitted to NIH must go through a two-step review process that includes the initial peer review for scientific and technical merit and a second step of review and approval by a National Advisory Council for program relevance. In addition, prior to an award or funding being made, NIH staff must conduct an administrative review for a number of other considerations. These include alignment with NIH's funding principles, review of the project budget, assessment of the applicant's management systems, determination of applicant eligibility, and compliance with public policy requirements. After all these steps have been completed, NIH officials make funding decisions on individual grant applications.

Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for grants?

Yes

What is the estimated Number of grants reviewed for approval	88
What is the estimated Number of grants recommended for approval	88
What is the estimated Dollar Value of grants recommended for approval	\$103,900,610

Grant Review Comments

N/A

How is access provided to the information for the Committee's documentation?

Checked if Applies

Contact DFO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Agency Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Online Committee Web Site	<input type="checkbox"/>
Online GSA FACA Web Site	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Publications	<input type="checkbox"/>

Other



Access Comments

Contact the National Library of Medicine Committee Management Office.